

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

FARU Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

Faculty of Architecture Research Unit (FARU) publications is committed to publishing and widely disseminating high-quality content. It is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical, behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: The author, the journal editor, the peer reviewers, and the publisher. Our expectations are that all involved have a shared understanding and acceptance on FARU publication ethics and malpractice. Our ethic statements are based on COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors available at <https://publicationethics.org/> or https://publicationethics.org/files/editable-bean/COPE_Core_Practices_0.pdf

Duties of the Editor in Chief

The editor in chief's responsibility is to determine which submission to the journal will be published. The editor in chief must ensure that decisions are made on the basis of the manuscript's merit and that the author's race, gender, religious or political beliefs, ethnicity, or citizenship are not considered.

Confidentiality

The editor in chief and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers will not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research purpose without the author's explicit written consent. Reviewers must recuse themselves from reviewing manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest.

Duties of Reviewers

- Purpose of Peer review

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the quality of the submission.

- Promptness

A potential reviewer should withdraw from the review process if unqualified to assess the contribution or cannot provide an assessment in a timely manner as defined by the editor.

- **Confidentiality**
Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Information concerning the manuscripts should not be discussed with others without the approval of the editor.
- **Standards of Objectivities**
Reviewers should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers' comments should be clearly expressed and supported by data or arguments.
- **Acknowledgement of sources**
Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor in chief's attention any substantial similarities or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.
- **Disclosure and Conflict of Interest**
Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used by the editorial committee members without the prior approval of the author's explicit written consent. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscript.

Duties of Authors

- **Reporting standards**
Authors of original research reports should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.
- **Data access and retention**
Authors could be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if practicable. In any event, authors should ensure accessibility of such data to other

competent professionals for a reasonable time after publications (preferably via an institutional data repository or other data center).

- **Authorship of the paper**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contribution should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspect of the research, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

- **Originality, Plagiarism, and acknowledgement of sources**

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works and will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be cited.

- **Multiple, Redundant, or Concurrent Publication**

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. Manuscripts which have been published as copyrighted material elsewhere cannot be submitted. In addition, manuscripts under review by one journal should not be submitted to other publications while the manuscript is under review.

- **Disclosure and Conflict of Interest**

The authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Readers should be informed about who has funded research and on the role of the funders in the research.

- **Fundamental errors in published work**

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher. If the editor or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper or to provide evidence to the editor of the correctness of the original paper.